

ENGLAND AND VENEZUELA

WITH THE HISTORY OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S "VIGOROUS" POLICY.

MR. OLNEY'S EFFORTS TO OBTAIN A REPLY FROM
LORD SALISBURY AND THE BRITISH
PREMIER'S DELIBERATION, THEREBY
CAUSING GREAT EMBARRASSMENT
TO MR. CLEVELAND.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Dec. 4.—President Cleveland and Secretary Olney were evidently much embarrassed in their treatment in yesterday's message of the Venezuela boundary dispute by the un-

willfulness of Lord Salisbury to reply in any way to the Administration's brief or protest of last July. The President, it is understood, was anxious to present to Congress the British as well as the Venezuelan or American side of the controversy and felt himself greatly handicapped in his recommendations by ignorance of what the Salisbury Government would do or would not do to settle the vexatious question of boundary

As is well known, the last Congress passed a resolution saying in effect that the recommendation in the President's annual message of 1894 looking to the arbitration of the boundary dis-

pute was wise, and suggesting that the matter be further pressed on Great Britain. The resolution was adopted shortly before Congress adjourned on March 4. Secretary Gresham did

Journal on March 4. Secretary Gresham did nothing in the way of a practical compliance with its terms, further than to discuss their intent with Attorney-General Olney. Mr. Olney made a brief of the case and some time before General Gresham's fatal illness submitted it to the State Department. Secretary Gresham's death followed, and on Mr. Olney's transfer to

The State Department he again took up the question. While on his summer vacation he gave a serious study to the subject. It will be remembered that in July, the date the President mentioned in his message, there was an unusual call issued by the Secretary of State summoning all absent members of the Cabinet to Washington. It was at this meeting of President Cleveland's advisers that the much-talked-of note o

the United States to Great Britain on the Venezuelan boundary dispute was considered and approved. The story published at the time was that the Cuban question was the subject of the conference, but that issue was not then brought

ference, but that issue was not referred to the Cabinet. The Cabinet approved Mr. Olney's paper, and that day it was mailed to Ambassador Bayard. It is reasonable to suppose that the note reached Lord Salisbury within ten days from the time it left Washington. But not one word in reply has been received at the State Department.

was the President's intention to refer in his message to Congress to the efforts of the Administration in the Venezuela case. Mr. Olney had stated that the President would be pleased to have Lord Salisbury's reply a few days before Congress met, that he might say what view England took of the arbitration proposition. Mr. Olney said that he was sure that the President was justified in so speaking of the matter, considering all the circumstances. He did not say that Mr. Bayard that the Administration was bending all its energies on the case of Venezuela, and that it expected to make a popular hit; but Mr. Olney said that he was sure that the President was

SOMETHING HAD TO BE DONE.

During Mr. Cleveland's present term the Administration has been in close relations with the British Foreign Office. It is a fact now well known here that one of Secretary Gresham's notes on Behring Sea affairs was really inspired

by Sir Julius Paunefote. Mr. Olney was satisfied that he would get an answer from Lord Salisbury some time before Congress convened without fail. He appears to have entertained this notion until Saturday. The month has elapsed, the Senate and House have adjourned, and the message was to be made public on Tuesday, but there was no word from England's Prime Minister. The Administration had manifested "vigor," but Great Britain had not shown her hand. On the contrary, Lord Salisbury had displayed "inactivity" and "indifference." The contempt for Mr. Olney's notes. Something must be done, and promptly. The President's message was complete, except that the chapter concerning Venezuelan affairs, to the President, as well as Mr. Olney, had not yet appeared and would be the country that was "vicious" and "vicious" note sent out by the

State Department in July remained unanswered in December.

Mr. Cleveland expressed much displeasure at the course of Lord Salisbury, and urged action on the part of the Secretary of State. Early the next morning Mr. Olney sent the second cable message to Mr. Bayard. It was reasonably long and particularly pointed. It said in brief that the Secretary had waited with due patience the reply of the British Foreign Office to his note of July, that no answer had been received, and that it was important that the answer should arrive that day. Mr. Bayard was instructed to call immediately upon Lord Salisbury.

bury, explain the circumstances and say to the Prime Minister that his views were much desired. Mr. Olney closed with an intimation to the effect that it would be a breach of courtesy considering the relations existing, for England not to send a reply forthwith. The Secretary of State asked for a reply through Mr. Bayard. Mr. Bayard was in London on Saturday. So was Lord Salisbury. But no dispatch was cabled by

him. Telegrams from the English and American date announced that the British Ministry had received the note forwarded by mail to Sir Julian Pauncefote an answer to the note of the American State Department concerning the proposition to submit to arbitration the Venezuelan boundary dispute.

This is the story of how the Administration failed in its much-talked-of effort at a display of vigor in foreign affairs, and why there was much disappointment and irritation at the result. It is a story which, in the face of the fact that we had not escape notice that Lord Salisbury has acted most deliberately. The news from London that notwithstanding the receipt at the Foreign Office of two appeals from the State Department that the matter was urgent, he finally mailed his answer two days before Congress met will doubtless attract attention to the Administration's embarrassments in stating satisfactory diplomatic policy, and reference to this important international dispute.

TO AMEND THE BALLOT LAW.

SENATOR RAINES' PLANS FOR PREVENTING REPETITIONS OF STATE TICKETS.

Albany, Dec. 4 (Special).—Senator John Raines was here this afternoon and had a talk with Secretary of State Palmer about certain amendments to the Blanket Ballot law which he intends to propose to "The Democratic State Committee," said Mr. Raines. "managed to get the Democratic State Ticket printed four times on the blanket ballot. The repetition of names on a law must be removed, and, as one thing of preventing it, I have drafted an amendment to the law increasing the number of names on the ticket to 100."

of signatures necessary for the making of a State nomination to \$500, and also making the requirement that a certain number of signatures shall be obtained in each of the sixty counties. This law prevents persons from getting 500 signatures in some one county and making a State nomination.

REPUBLICANS CARRIED NEW-HAVEN

OVER 700 PROTESTED BALLOTS ALLOWED BY BOARD OF ARBITRATION.

New-Haven, Dec. 4 (Special).—A Board of Arbitration met to-night and passed judgment on the protested ballots cast in yesterday's town and city election. Over seven hundred ballots were protested on the ground of illegal type, all having

been cast by Republicans. This dispute kept the outcome of the election in doubt, but to-night the Board ruled that the votes were legal, and that the full Republican city and town tickets were elected. This decision gives the Republicans control of the town government, and the Democrats will probably meet in the council chambers. The Republicans have a majority on the town ticket was only twenty-one, and on the city ticket about seventy-five.